

United States District Court  
Boston Mass.

Emergency Motion For Complaint.

Michael DeFendis **10 CAT 12214 GAO**  
Plaintiff Pro Se

Nancy DeFendis et al  
Defendants namely her attorneys

Judge Kenny

Judge Rocket

Judge Langlois

Judge McSweeney

John + Jane Doe

All of the Middlesex Probate  
Court Cambridge

Correspondent + Co Conspirators

The Plaintiff requests Trial by Jury

Juris Dictional issues are not Domestic  
issues. They are For matter and purpose  
issues derived by Deprivation of Equal  
Access to the Courts 38 USC 1331 Equal  
Protection of the Law 38 USC 1331. And  
gender Bins 38 USC 1983. Juris Diction as per 38 USC  
1332

As per the 14th Amendment the Plaintiff  
complains that a court judgement had been  
rendered on Dec 8, 2010 by the Probate court  
and the Defendants fail to abide by that  
judgement as of this day

The Plaintiff has approached that Probate  
court to file appropriate motions and

Filing to expedite those after a judged and to correct that court's incorrect findings. The Plaintiff was refused a hearing or establish an Emergency Trial to correct the massive acts of the Defendant. On Dec 17, 2010, Dec 20, 2010, and Dec 21, 2010. On Nov of the afores mentioned dates would the clerks nor the Judge hear or respond to the appropriate motions attempted to be filed by the Plaintiff. ~~and~~ These individual clerks and Judge refused to address nor prepare nor to give equal court time to the defendant to establish his complaint.

Time is of the essence for the primary judgment of Dec 8, was to allow the Plaintiff and children their 1st amendment right to Freedom of Family and the Plaintiff has been patient for 7 years in order for that right to be accomplished and condoned by the court.

This is not the 1st time this court has not given the Plaintiff his due process rights to equal access to the courts and equal protection of the law.

To name several apparent court violation the court has refused to acknowledge are August 2006, April 5, 2007, July 11, 2009 and current Dec 17, 2010, 21.

This court has determined that it favors<sup>3</sup> the defendant and is reluctant to abide by state law, state case law, mass practice, Federal law and Federal case law. And disregards the god given, common law practice of freedom of family described in all the above mentioned Agendas.

Even when the court makes judgement the court is reluctant to uphold its own decisions. And even allow the Plaintiff to be removed from the court at its own jurisdiction without a contempt complaint established by the Cambridge police dept with out orders from this court and find there by denied equal protection of the law and equal access to the court where the Plaintiff had a long awaited contempt complaint scheduled to be tried.

The Cambridge Probate court demonstrates gender bias and refuses to correct its violations of law on many occasions.

The Plaintiff and his sons have suffered long enough. the boy are 14 + 17 and are of above ordinary intelligence. The Plaintiff Father was their primary care giver for 11 years and has never been proved otherwise.

There are other pressing issues that must be addressed. but are out of such

Substantial and Emergency basis as the  
1st Amendment Right to Freedom of Family

The Plaintiff initially request that  
this Federal court allow the Family to  
Reunite as proscribed by Law and Probate  
Court Judgment of Dec 8, 2010.

The Plaintiff requires that the sons  
and Father be re-inbursed for their  
lost time together and is basing the  
loss on prior 2006 case law in Federal  
court of \$95,000 per child per year.

And to be born by ~~each, individually~~, Defendant.  
And access fixes to the Judges, Middlesex  
County Probate court and its employees whom  
have abetted the cause of the violations.  
and Reunite the Father & son as soon as possible.

Respectfully submitted

Dec 31, 2010

Michael DeFendis  
M. DeFendis